

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**Serial No. 10/811,165**

Reply to Office Action dated: 9/13/07

Response dated: 11/21/07

NOV 21 2007**PATENT
PU020236**

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 1-12 are pending in the application and that claims 1-12 stand rejected. By this response the Applicant's claim 2 has been cancelled claims 1, 3, 4, and 7-11 have been amended to more clearly define the invention of the Applicant and not in response to prior art.

In view of the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the Applicant respectfully submits that none of these claims now pending in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Thus the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

Rejections

A. 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected the Applicant's claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0081940, hereinafter "Lin"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim" (Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Holst & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added).

The Applicant has herein cancelled claim 2 and claims 1, 3, 4, and 7-11 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. Support for the amendments to the Applicant's claims can be found throughout the Applicant's Specification and at least at page 9, line 29 to page 10, line 7, and page 11, lines 8-9 of the Applicants' Specification.

The Applicant submits that Lin absolutely fails to teach each and every element of the Applicant's claimed invention, arranged as in at least the Applicant's amended claim 1, which specifically recites:

"In a video recording device, a method for playback at a speed faster than normal playback speed for programming originating from film without loss of program information, comprising the steps of:

identifying during playback repeated image information indicative of film original material; and,

selectively dropping ones of said identified repeated image information to increase a playback speed of said programming originating from film,

wherein a number of the selectively dropped ones of said identified repeated image information is determined directly responsive to a user input specifying non-speed time information or an integer representing which

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**Serial No. 10/811,165**

Reply to Office Action dated: 9/13/07

Response dated: 11/21/07

**PATENT
PU020236**

occurrence of a same repeated image information is to be dropped. (emphasis added).

More specifically, the Applicant submits that there is absolutely no teaching or disclosure in Lin for a method in a recording device including identifying during playback repeated image information indicative of film original material and, selectively dropping ones of the identified repeated image information to increase a playback speed of the programming originating from film "wherein a number of the selectively dropped ones of said identified repeated image information is determined directly responsive to a user input specifying non-speed time information or an integer representing which occurrence of a same repeated image information is to be dropped" as taught in the Applicant's Specification and claimed by at least the Applicant's amended claim 1.

In contrast to the invention of the Applicant, Lin, with respect to the teachings of Lin, and specifically claims 1 and 7, determines "the overall number of pictures deleted from the video signal [based] on the **selected fast motion speed**" (Lin, para. [00056]), such resultant control being irrespective of a completion time that may be desired by a user.

In contrast to Lin, in the invention of the Applicant, at least with respect to claim 1, if a user has only a certain amount of time in which to watch an encoded movie, a user input specifying non-speed time information is more relevant and useful to the user than simply speeding up the display presentation without having an idea of when the presentation will actually complete.

Moreover, given that users desire more and more control over all aspects of video presentation to which they are to view, allowing a user to provide a user input that specifies an Integer representing which occurrence of a same redundant image information/field is to be dropped allows the user greater and more direct control over the presentation the user is to view. There is absolutely no such teaching in the invention of Lin.

The user inputs of the Applicant's invention, advantageous over Lin, provide more usefulness (non-speed time information, such as desired completion time) and user control (integer) than that afforded by the invention of Lin. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Lin absolutely fail to teach each and every

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**Serial No. 10/811,165**

Reply to Office Action dated: 9/13/07

Response dated: 11/21/07

PATENT**PU020236**

element of the Applicant's claimed invention, arranged as in at least the Applicant's amended claim 1 as required for anticipation.

Furthermore and with respect to the Applicant's claim 4, the Applicant respectfully submits that Lin does not teach or suggest "wherein said user input specifying the non-speed time information identifies a desired time for completion of playback of a recorded presentation", as now recited in amended Claim 4. Moreover, it is respectfully asserted that Lin does not teach or suggest "wherein said user input specifying the non-speed time information identifies a desired time for completion of said presentation", as now recited in amended Claim 11. In contrast, as noted above with respect to the argument made concerning independent Claim 1, Lin determines "the overall number of pictures deleted from the video signal [based] on the **selected fast motion speed**" (Lin, para. [00056]), such resultant control being irrespective of a completion time that may be desired by a user.

While the Examiner has cited page 5, paragraph [0056] of Lin as disclosing the limitations of the pre-mended versions of Claims 4 and 11, stating "when user selects playback speed, effectively selects time for completion of presentation", the Applicants respectfully disagree. A completion time is just that, namely an exact time at which completion of the presentation is to occur. In contrast, many users could conceivably have difficulty computing and/or otherwise arriving at a completion time from a selected playback speed. Moreover, the Examiner's position requires at least an additional step (i.e., the computation of completion time from the playback speed), which is avoided by the Applicants' invention as claimed in Claims 4 and 11, thus providing the user with a more efficient and user friendly system as related to the use of completion time as a user input.

As such and for at least the reasons recited above, the Applicant respectfully submits that Lin fails to teach each and every element of the Applicant's claimed invention, arranged as in at least the Applicant's amended claims 1, 4, 7 and 11. More specifically, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Applicant's amended independent claim 1 fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and is patentable thereunder for at least the reasons recited above.

Likewise, independent claim 7 recites similar relevant features as recited in the Applicant's independent claim 1. As such the Applicant submits that for at least the reasons recited above, the Applicant's independent claim 7 is also not anticipated by the

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**Serial No. 10/811,165**

Reply to Office Action dated: 9/13/07

Response dated: 11/21/07

NOV 21 2007**PATENT
PU020236**

teachings of Lin and as such, claim 7 also fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and is patentable thereunder for at least the reasons recited above.

Furthermore, dependent claims 3-6 and 8-12 depend either directly or indirectly from the Applicant's independent claims 1 and 7 and recite additional features therefor. As such and for at least the reasons set forth herein, the Applicant submits that dependent claims 3-6 and 8-12 are also not anticipated by the teachings of Lin. Therefore the Applicant submits that dependent claims 3-6 and 8-12 also fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and are patentable thereunder.

Conclusion

Thus the Applicant submits that none of the claims, presently in the application, are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Consequently, the Applicant believes that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Alan Schultz

By: 

Jorge Tony Villabon, Attorney
Reg. No. 52,322
(609) 734-6445

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

November 21, 2007